

## REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-29 are presently pending. In this response, claims 1, 6-8, 11, 14, and 27 are amended. The specification has been amended to correct errors of a typographical nature.

(1) Claims 1-18 and 20-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ross et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,629,135; and

(2) Claims 19, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ross in view of Gupta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. With regard to the rejection set forth above in (1), Applicant submits that Ross does not disclose at least the text of “the analysis data window presented concurrently with and in proximity to the respective product page” (emphasis added) as recited in each of the amended independent claims 1 and 11.

Applicant reads Ross as teaching a host service for merchant (e.g., online store) sites. Ross provides a service on the Internet for online merchants to design online stores by using a set of limited store templates and widgets. See, e.g., col. 12, line 41-col. 13, line 45 of Ross. Once an online merchant customizes the given store template with the given set of widgets, the content (e.g., product pages) of the store is dynamically generated upon the activation of the store. See, e.g., col. 15, lines 5-26 and col. 3, lines 14-57 of Ross. The host service (e.g., Nexchange.net) hosts the online store with the dynamically generated content, and serves product pages to the buyers to the online stores. See, e.g., col. 3, lines 14-22 and col. 4, lines 46-60 of Ross. The figures of Ross show two examples of online stores hosted by Nexchange.net, i.e., About.com (see FIG. 15 of Ross) and Culinary Café (see FIG. 19 of Ross). In addition, the host service provides certain management services such as reports on activities on each online store. See, e.g., col. 15, line 36 to col. 16, line 4 and FIG. 21 of Ross.

Although Ross teaches a reporting service on activities of each online store, the presentation of the reports in Ross is given on plain Web pages of the “Merchant Manager” pages. None of the report presentation in Ross is given in one or more analysis data windows presented concurrently with and in proximity to a respective product page having product information about one or more products, as recited in claims 1 and 11. After careful review of the text and figures of Ross, the Applicant could not find any disclosure of or any figure showing an analysis data window presented concurrently with and in proximity to a respective product page having product information about one or more products.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Ross. Amended independent claim 27 includes the text of displaying “an analysis data window concurrently with and in proximity to a respective one of the product pages” (emphasis added). The arguments given above with respect to independent claims 1 and 11 apply to independent claim 27. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 27 are patentable over Ross.

It should be noted that the Applicant has performed clarifying amendments to independent claims 1 and 11 to indicate that “a type of analysis data being determined automatically by determining a type of analyst that uses the interface” and “the user being in a user class and the type of analysis being determined automatically by determining the user's user class”, respectively (emphasis added). These amendments were not made for patentability purposes. Applicant respectfully submits that Ross also does not disclose the text of “the type of analysis data being determined automatically by a type of analyst that uses the interface” and “the user being in a user class and the type of analysis being determined automatically by the user's user class” from claims 1 and 11, respectively, prior to amendment in this response. Independent claims 1 and 11 prior to amendment in this response will be called “unamended” herein.

In unamended independent claims 1 and 11, an analysis data window has analysis data. The analysis data is about the effectiveness of a product page, and the type of analysis data is determined automatically by a type of analyst (claim 1) or by the user's user

class (claim 11). The Examiner points to col. 8, lines 6-19 and col. 15, lines 36-47 of Ross as disclosing an analysis data window. However, Ross states that “[a] valid host representative will have on-demand access to a report showing visits to their links and sales” (col. 15, lines 37-38 of Ross). If the “report” in Ross is considered to be an “analysis data window” for sake of argument, then Ross makes it clear that the requester would not even see a report if the requester is not a valid host representative. Thus, in the situation in Ross where an invalid host representative is found, no report and therefore no “analysis data window” or “analysis data” would be shown.

In the case in Ross where a valid host representative is found, there is no disclosure in Ross that the type of analysis data shown in the report window is determined automatically by a type of analyst or the user class of the user that uses the interface. Instead, it appears in Ross that a valid host representative will have access to any part of the report and there is no type of analysis data that is determined automatically by a type of analyst or the user class of the user that uses the interface.

Thus, Ross does not disclose the text of “the type of analysis data being determined automatically by a type of analyst that uses the interface” or “the user being in a user class and the type of analysis being determined automatically by the user's user class” as recited in the previous versions of the independent claims 1 and 11, respectively. Because amended independent claims 1, 11 include similar text, independent claims 1, 11 are patentable over Ross for at least this reason (in addition to the reasons given above). Additionally, independent claim 27 contains the text of “where a specific type of analysis data that is displayed in the analysis data window is determined automatically by determining a type of analyst that uses the interface.” The arguments given with respect to unamended claims 1 and 11 also apply to independent claim 27, and Applicant submits independent claim 27 is patentable over Ross for at least this reason.

Because independent claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Ross, dependent claims 2-10, 12-18, and 20-26 are patentable for at least the reasons given with respect to independent claims 1 and 11.

With regard to the rejection set forth above in (2), because independent claims 11 and 27 are patentable, dependent claims 19, 28, and 29 are also patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to independent claims 11 and 27. Moreover, while Gupta does describe authentication of a user using cookies (see col. 11, line 39 to col. 12, line 61), there is no disclosure or implication in Gupta that a user class is examined using a subfield of a cookie (claim 19) or that the type of analyst is determined automatically by extracting data from a cookie (claims 28 and 29). In other words, the authentication in Gupta does not teach or imply that a user class or type of analyst is determined from a cookie, as recited in dependent claims 19, 28, and 29.


Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 19, 28, and 29 are patentable over the combination of Ross and Gupta.

It should be noted that clarifying amendments were also performed on claims 6-8 and 14, and such clarifying amendments were not performed for patentability purposes.

Based on the foregoing arguments, it should be apparent that claims 1-29 are thus allowable over the reference(s) cited by the Examiner, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections.

S.N. 09/672,363  
Art Unit: 2145

Respectfully submitted:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert J. Mauri  
Reg. No.: 41,180

7/14/05  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400  
Facsimile: (203)944-0245  
email: rmauri@hspatent.com

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

7/14/05  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Clair F. Mauri  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Person Making Deposit